

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,859	07/30/2003	Gary F. Gerard	IVGN 338	6152
65482 7590 10/30/2007 INVITROGEN CORPORATION C/O INTELLEVATE			EXAMINER	
			BURKHART, MICHAEL D	
P.O. BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1633	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/629,859	GERARD, GARY F.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Michael D. Burkhart	1633		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Do- resions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be solid apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 O This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 9,12-14,17,19-21 and 26 is/are pendi 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 9,12-14,17,19-21 and 26 is/are reject Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration. ed.			
Applicati	on Papers	•			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Significantial in the drawing(s) is consistent of the drawing(s) is consistent or the drawing of the drawing	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) Notic 3) Infor	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:			

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/11/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9, 12-14, 17, 19-21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rothenberg et al (J. Virol., 1974) as evidenced by Murray et al (Medical Microbiology, 1998). This rejection is maintained for reasons made of record in the Office Action dated 7/11/2007, and for reasons set forth below.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants essentially assert that: 1) Rothenberg et al do not teach a purified polypeptide having reverse-transcriptase activity, but rather teach the use of detergent-disrupted Art Unit: 1633

virions, which comprise elements other than reverse transcriptase, such as viral glycoproteins, etc., 2) the virion preparations of Rothenberg et al might also contain Mg²⁺, thus, the total amount of Mg²⁺ in the reactions of Rothenberg et al may exceed the total amount of dNTPs.

Regarding 1), the virions used by Rothenberg et al, and hence the reverse transcriptase contained within the virions, were purified from NIH3T3 cells by isopycnic banding of the virions. See page 168, second column, first full ¶ of Rothenberg et al, and the method referenced therein, found on page 168 of Rothenberg et al (J. Virol., 1976). Thus, absent a definition of a "purified" polypeptide having reverse-transcriptase activity in the specification, the term is interpreted broadly to include purification of the reverse transcriptase enzyme from the NIH3T3 cells by isopycnic banding of the virions. This represents a great level of purification relative to the number and amount of contaminants (e.g. host cell membrane components, host nucleic acids, cellular proteins) that are present prior to purification of the virions from the host cell. Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., purification of reverse transcriptase away from other viral components, such as viral glycoproteins) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding 2), a review of the prior art of record reveals no mention of Mg²⁺ in the virion preparations. It is thus unclear from where applicant believes such free Mg²⁺ may be coming from. Absent any reasoning or evidence as to why the purified virions would comprise Mg²⁺, and in sufficient amounts (e.g. 6 mM) to offset the Mg²⁺/dNTP concentration differential taught

Art Unit: 1633

by Rothenberg et al, the rejection stands. "Argument of counsel cannot take the place of evidence lacking in the record." In re Scarbrough, 182 USPQ 298, 302 (CCPA 1974).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The cDNA and nucleic acid molecules of the claims are not recited as isolated or purified, and thus read on a product of nature. It is noted that the claims are product by process claims, but are not limited by the process steps, only the structure implied by the steps. See MPEP §2113. As such, the claims encompass cDNA and nucleic acid made, for example, by a retrovirus upon infection of a host cell.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Burkhart whose telephone number is (571) 272-2915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1633

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael D. Burkhart Examiner

Art Unit 1633

M BN